



1 submission and moving the pretrial conference and trial dates addresses Plaintiff's concern  
2 regarding the date of the hearing on the motion for summary judgment and renders Plaintiff's  
3 *ex parte* application to move the hearing date moot.

4 The court next considers Plaintiff's *ex parte* application to strike Defendant's cross-  
5 motion for summary judgment or in the alternative, to be granted an extension of time to file  
6 a responsive pleading. The court has reviewed Defendant document titled "[Defendant's]  
7 OPPOSITION MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES REGARDING  
8 [Plaintiff's] MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT, SUMMARY ADJUDICATION,  
9 PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION; NOTICE OF MOTION AND CROSS-MOTION FOR  
10 SUMMARY JUDGMENT AND SUMMARY ADJUDICATION OF AFFIRMATIVE  
11 DEFENSE" (hereinafter "Defendant's Opposition"). After reviewing Defendant's  
12 Opposition, the court does not agree with Plaintiff that the pleading actually constitutes a  
13 cross-motion for summary judgment, regardless of what the title says. The court finds  
14 Defendant's Opposition is simply an opposition to Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment  
15 and will construe Defendant's Opposition as such.

16 Having made that finding, however, the court also finds Defendant's Opposition is  
17 written in a way that conveys some ambiguity as to exactly what Defendant intends to  
18 accomplish as a result of the pleading. The parties are cautioned to keep in mind precisely  
19 what issues are before this court and what issues are before the Ecuadorian court. The only  
20 issues before this court are the issues raised by Plaintiff's complaint and by Defendant's  
21 defenses to the allegations in that complaint. Thus, the Ecuadorian Decree 1038-A, which  
22 Defendant discusses at some length and in many different contexts, is relevant in this case  
23 only as to two issues: (1) does Decree 1038-A modify or otherwise inform the legal standard  
24 this court will employ to determine whether Plaintiff is entitled to summary judgment in its  
25 claims; and (2) does Decree 1038-A modify or otherwise inform the legal standard this court  
26 will employ in determining the validity of any affirmative defense Defendant may assert? In  
27  
28

1 other words, this court will consider the impact of Decree 1038-A only insofar as it may  
2 inform or modify the legal analysis in this case in this court.

3 Whether Decree 1038-A may or may not modify or inform the legal analysis the  
4 Ecuadorian court applies to the issues before it in the Ecuadorian action is of no concern to  
5 this court. The court has previously discussed the non-identity of the action instituted in  
6 Ecuador by Defendant and the Action instituted in this country by Plaintiff. The parties are  
7 referred to the court's memorandum opinion and order filed June 27, 2005, Document # 62,  
8 where the court discussed the separate nature of the actions and the lack of preclusive effect  
9 that one court's determination might have on the other. The court points out that to date  
10 neither party has presented a compelling argument that either this court or the Ecuadorian  
11 court is under an obligation to harmonize its determinations with those of the other court.  
12 Thus, the court recognizes the possibility, in the abstract, that Plaintiff in this case may  
13 receive a favorable judgment on its allegation of breach of contract, for example; only to find  
14 its judgment unenforceable in Ecuador where Defendant has secured a favorable judgment on  
15 its allegation of breach of contract, which may well be unenforceable in this country

16 The court will deny Plaintiff's *ex parte* application to strike Defendant's alleged  
17 "cross-motion" for summary judgment. The court will, however, disregard any argument  
18 appearing in Defendants pleading that the court finds irrelevant to the issues directly before  
19 the court in this case. Plaintiff will be granted ten (10) days from the date of service of this  
20 order to file and serve a response to Defendants Opposition.

21 Plaintiff has also made an *ex parte* application to strike portions of Defendant's reply  
22 brief in support of its motion to dismiss Plaintiff's complaint pursuant to FRCP 12(c) because  
23 Defendant's reply set forth two entirely new arguments that had not been raised in its initial  
24 opposition. The court has examined the portion of Defendant's reply brief to which Plaintiff  
25 refers. The argument Defendant presents in this section appears to be a generalized statement  
26 on the limitations of declaratory relief where the parties' relationship to each other has  
27  
28

1 ceased, except for the determination of claims for damages for past wrongs, and there are no  
2 rights that remain to be allocated pertaining to any future relationship. The objected-to  
3 portion of Defendants reply also appears to set forth an argument against the use of  
4 declaratory relief as a means of establishing res judicata over issues being litigated in another  
5 case. It is also possible that the objected-to portion may be extraneous material meant as  
6 additional background to their argument on the defense of litigation privilege.

7 The problem the court faces is that it is not confined to the cases cited by the parties  
8 in making its determination as to what scope of declaratory relief, if any, it may grant with  
9 respect to Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment. Thus, the court could strike Defendants  
10 arguments as requested, but independently cite one or more cases used by Defendant to  
11 determine the lawful extent of declaratory relief, particularly as such relief may relate to the  
12 case in progress in Ecuador. In other words, even if the court strikes the objected-to  
13 argument, the court could find itself citing cases from the stricken portion of Defendant's  
14 reply to make determination concerning the appropriateness of declaratory relief. The court  
15 finds the surest way to avoid prejudice to either party is to deny Plaintiff's motion to strike  
16 without prejudice and allow Plaintiff to file a sur-reply.

17  
18 Therefore, in consideration of the foregoing discussion, it is hereby ORDERED that:

- 19 1. Plaintiff's *ex parte* application for rescheduling of hearing on motions to dismiss and  
20 for summary judgment is DENIED as moot.
- 21 2. Plaintiff's *ex parte* application to strike those portions of Defendant's Opposition that  
22 may be construed as a cross-motion for summary judgment is DENIED. Plaintiff may  
23 file and serve a reply brief in support of its motion for summary judgment on or  
24 before 4:00 p.m. on Tuesday, April 18, 2006.
- 25 3. Plaintiff's *ex parte* application to strike a portion of Defendant's reply brief in support  
26 of its motion to dismiss is DENIED without prejudice. Plaintiff may file and serve a  
27

1 sur-reply brief on or before 4:00 p.m. on Tuesday, April 18, 2006.

2  
3 IT IS SO ORDERED.

4 **Dated:** April 7, 2006  
h2ehf

/s/ Anthony W. Ishii  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE